

REMARKS

The present filing is responsive to the Office Action.

Summary of the Response

Claims 1, 10 and 12 have been amended. Claims 3 and 13 have been canceled. New claims 17-22 have been added. Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-22 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application as amended are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 7-11 and 13, 14 and 16.¹

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 4, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (Pub. No. 2001/0015716) taken with Igari (USP 6,121,952). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim taken with Igari as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Howard (Pub. No. 2003/0052614). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim taken with Igari as applied to claim 1 in item 3

¹ There appears to be an inconsistency in the identification of the claims that are objected to. Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary page indicates claims 3, 7-11, 13-14 and 16 are objected to, but page 5 of the Office Action indicates that claims 7-11 and 13-16 are objected to. Given that in the substantive rejections, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 15 are stated as being obvious over various specific combinations of references, but the Examiner did not specifically address the basis of rejection of claim 3, claim 3 is treated as being objected to, and containing allowable subject matter.

hereinabove, and further in view of Hattori (Pub. No. 2001/0020925). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim taken with Igari as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Sanford et al. (USP 6,667,791). These rejections are respectfully traversed.²

While Applicant disagrees with the rejections, given the indication of allowable subject matter, Applicant amended claims 1 and 12 to incorporate the patentable subject matter of claims 3 and 13, respectively. Further, Applicant amended patentable claim 16 in independent form. Amended claims 1, 12 and 16, and all their dependent claims should be patentable.

New Claims

Applicant added new dependent claims 17 to 22 to round out the coverage of the invention. These claims should be patentable given the patentable base claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in this application are patentable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues that may not have been adequately addressed in this response.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this transmittal and associated documents, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501288 referencing the attorney docket number of this application.

² See footnote 1 re discrepancy in claim status.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: June 24, 2008

Wen Liu
Registration No. 32,822

LIU & LIU
444 S. Flower Street; Suite 1750
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 830-5743
Facsimile: (213) 830-5741
Email: wliu@liulaw.com